



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,542	01/30/2001	Ehud Levy	40654/252166	9253
23370 7	590 12/21/2005		EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ			CECIL, TERRY K	
	STOCKTON, LLP		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1100 PEACHTREE STREET			AKI ONII	TAI ER NOMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30309			1723	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/772,542	LEVY, EHUD		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Mr. Terry K. Cecil	1723		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 October 2005</u> .					
		action is non-final.			
3)□	<u> </u>				
Dispositi	ion of Claims	,			
4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9 and 13-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachmen	t(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
3) 🔲 Infom	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		te atent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/772,542 Page 2

Art Unit: 1723

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application contains claims 7-9 and 13-41 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the Paper filed 4-7-2003. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 35 USC § 103

The 102 and 103 rejections of the prior office action have not changed.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 10-14-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:
- Applicant's arguments that the honeycombed filter media of DeLiso is not a rigid, porous solid is unconvincing since each cell of the solid structure is considered to be a "pore".
 DeLiso teaches that 400 cells can be present per square inch with 6 mil partitions therebetween (example 2).
- Despite applicant's remarks to the contrary, the examiner contends that the intended use "for drinking water" in the preamble of the claim does not distinguish over the art of DeLiso since each claimed element in the claim (e.g. zirconia, activated carbon particles and organic binder) is found in the teachings of DeLiso and in the claimed percentages (claims 1-3). It is contended that the filter device could certainly be used to filter water in a vapor phase. In addition, it is pointed out that contaminants within liquid water larger that the openings of the

Art Unit: 1723

cells would be filtered out. Applicant's claims do not require "removing heavy metals and organic contaminants...yielding drinkable water" as argued by the applicant on page 4.

- Applicant's arguments (pages 2-3) pointing out the differences in the way his invention and DeLiso is made is unconvincing since applicant has not claimed a method of making nor a product-by-process.
- Concerning applicant's arguments spanning pages 3-4, the examiner contends that each additional component listed is anticipated by DeLiso and that these components are not just benign fillers, as applicant seems to argue, but each is selectively added to "impart specific characteristics or properties" (col. 5, lines 30-48)—providing motivation to the skilled man to optimize the relative percentages of components in order to have the desired characteristics and properties in the resulting media.

Conclusion

3. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

Art Unit: 1723

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Contact Information:

- Examiner Mr. Terry K. Cecil can be reached at (571) 272-1138 at the Carlisle campus in Alexandria, Virginia for any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner. Note that the examiner is on the increased flextime schedule but can normally be found in the office during the hours of 8:30a to 4:30p, on at least four days during the week M-F.
- Wanda Walker, the examiner's supervisor, can be reached at (571) 272-1151 if attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful.
- The Fax number for this art unit for official faxes is (571) 273-8300.
- Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2†7-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

TKC December 15, 2005